

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUN 11 2019

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

MICHAEL SKIDMORE, AS TRUSTEE
FOR THE RANDY CRAIG WOLFE
TRUST,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

LED ZEPPELIN; JAMES PATRICK
PAGE; ROBERT ANTHONY PLANT;
JOHN PAUL JONES; SUPER HYPE
PUBLISHING, INC.; WARNER MUSIC
GROUP CORPORATION; WARNER
CHAPPELL MUSIC, INC.; ATLANTIC
RECORDING CORPORATION; RHINO
ENTERTAINMENT COMPANY,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 16-56057

D.C. No.

2:15-cv-03462-RGK-AGR

Central District of California,
Los Angeles

ORDER

MICHAEL SKIDMORE, AS TRUSTEE
FOR THE RANDY CRAIG WOLFE
TRUST,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

WARNER/CHAPPELL MUSIC, INC,

Defendant-Appellant.

and

LED ZEPPELIN; JAMES PATRICK
PAGE; ROBERT ANTHONY PLANT;
JOHN PAUL JONES; SUPER HYPE
PUBLISHING, INC.; WARNER MUSIC
GROUP CORPORATION, ATLANTIC
RECORDING CORPORATION; RHINO
ENTERTAINMENT COMPANY,

Defendants,

No. 16-56287

D.C. No.

2:15-cv-03462-RGK-AGR

THOMAS, Chief Judge and En Banc Coordinator:

In order to clarify the scope of en banc rehearing in these cases, “[w]hen a case is heard or reheard en banc, the en banc [court] assumes jurisdiction over the entire case, see 28 U.S.C. § 46(c), regardless of the issue or issues that may have caused any member of the Court to vote to hear the case en banc.” Kyocera Corp. v. Prudential-Bache Trade Servs., Inc., 341 F.3d 987, 995 (9th Cir. 2003) (quoting Summerlin v. Stewart, 309 F.3d 1193, 1193 (9th Cir. 2002)). Although “the en

banc [court] may, in its discretion, choose to limit the issues it considers, . . . the en
banc [court] is under no obligation to do so.” Id.